

### **REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the finding of allowability in claim 14 and respectfully requests consideration and allowance of the subject application.

#### **Claim Amendments**

Claims 1-38 were previously pending.

Claim 14 is allowed.

Claims 5 is amended.

Claims 1-4, 6-13, and 15-38 were previously canceled.

No new claims are added.

Claims 5 and 14 are pending.

#### **Claim 14**

Applicant appreciates the finding of allowability in claim 14.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶2**

The Office rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office states the claim limitation “the interaction” in lines 20 and 22 is unclear due to insufficient antecedent basis concerning an “interrupting” or “interrupted” status.

**Claim 5**

Claim 5, as amended, defines a speech system, including:

- a speech server;
- an interaction object that is callable by one or more speech-enabled applications to enable a speech-enabled application to submit an interaction to the speech server;
- an interaction manager configured to prioritize interactions submitted to the speech server by ordering the interactions in an interaction list, the interaction list having a front and an end, wherein an interaction at the front of the interaction list is processed before other interactions in the interaction list are processed;
  - wherein the interaction manager places an interaction received from a speech-enabled application at the end of the interaction list unless the interaction manager detects an indication to place the interaction received from the speech-enabled application at the front of the interaction list ahead of other interactions in the interaction list;
  - wherein the interaction manager places the interaction received from the speech-enabled application at the front of the list if the interaction manager detects an indication to do so in the interaction received from the speech-enabled application;
  - wherein the interaction manager interrupts an interaction currently processing when an interaction received by the speech-enabled application is added to the interaction list and the application specifies that the newly added interaction is to interrupt the interaction currently being processed; and
  - wherein after the interrupting interaction is processed, the interrupted interaction may resume processing where the interrupted interaction left off, start over, or the interrupted interaction does not resume processing after the interrupting interaction is processed if a self-destruct flag is set in the interrupted interaction.

The Applicant submits that the above revisions to claim 5 are fully supported under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, at least by page 4, lines 15-22 and page 5, lines 1-9 of the Applicant's Specification, as well as by Figures 3 and 4.

Applicant submits the current amendments to claim 5 resolve the ambiguity regarding the limitation “the interaction” and overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶2 rejection.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 5.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant is grateful for the finding of allowability in claim 14 and respectfully suggests that claim 5 is now in condition for allowance. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 4-27-06

By: Mark C. Farrell

Lee & Hayes PLLC

Mark C. Farrell

Reg. No. 45,988

(509) 324-9256